REMARKS

The Examiner's communication mailed July 26, 2005 has been received and carefully considered. In conformance with the applicable statutory requirements, this paper constitutes a complete reply and/or a bona fide attempt to advance the application to final action. Specifically, claims 18, 24, 30, 34, 36, 37 and 42 have been amended. Claim 35 has been cancelled. In addition, detailed arguments in support of patentability are presented. Reexamination and/or reconsideration of the application as amended are respectfully requested.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-17, 22, 23, 28, 29 and 38-41 are indicated as allowable over prior art of record.

Claims 42 and 43 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

Claims 24-27 and 30-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hartmann (U.S. Patent No. 2,719,275).

Claims 20 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartmann in view of Diener et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,004,135).

Claims 34-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shikata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,183).

35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 24 and 30 (claims 25-27 depend from claim 24 and claims 31-33 depend from claim 30) have been carefully amended to overcome the §112, second paragraph indefiniteness rejections.

The Claims Distinguish Patentably Over the References of Record

Claim 1 and claims 2-17 and 38-41 dependent therefrom were allowed.

Claim 18 has been amended to call for sets of concentric, telescoped conductive tubes to each have an elongated central passage accommodating at least one primary winding. The Examiner indicated that the rejection of claim 18 on the prior art could be

overcome if the primary winding was included as a structural element in the claim, which the Examiner indicated could be accomplished by deleting the word "for" in line 5 of claim 18. Accordingly, as amended, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 and claims 19-21 dependent therefrom are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 22 and claim 23 which is dependent from claim 22 were both indicated as being allowed.

Claim 24 was not substantively rejected over the prior art. In particular, the Examiner indicated that claim 24 would be given favorable consideration if suitably amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and if amended to include the primary winding as a structural element. As indicated in the preceding section, claim 24 has been carefully amended to overcome the § 112 rejection. Moreover, claim 24 has been amended to call for a pair of parallel elongated central passages accommodating said primary winding. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 24 and claims 25-27 dependent therefrom are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 28 and claim 29 dependent from claim 28 were both indicated as being allowed.

Claim 30 was not substantively rejected over the prior art. In particular, the Examiner indicated that claim 30 would be given favorable treatment if suitably amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 discussed above and if amended to include the primary winding as a structural element in the claims. As indicated in the preceding section, claim 30 has been carefully amended to overcome the § 112 rejection. Moreover, claim 30 has been amended to call for a pair of parallel elongated central passages accommodating said primary winding. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 30 and claims 31-33 dependent therefrom are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 34, as amended, calls for each of a number of modules to further comprise a first conductive tube with first and second ends, a generally parallel closely adjacent second conductive tube with first and second ends, wherein said tubes each have a central elongated passage accommodating one or more primary windings, a magnetic core surrounding each of the tubes, the first ends of the tubes joined together, and a circuit forming connector at the second ends of the tubes. Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art neither discloses nor fairly suggests a high frequency transformer for an electric

arc welder as called for in claim 34. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 34 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 35 has been cancelled.

Claim 42, which was indicated as containing allowable subject matter, has been placed in independent form. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 42 and claims 36-37 and 43, which are dependent from claim 42, are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

All formal and informal matters having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Alternatively, if the Examiner is of the view that the application is not in clear condition for allowance, it is requested that he telephone the undersigned for purposes of conducting a telephone interview to resolve any outstanding differences. In any case, an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

August 31, 2005 Date

Robert V. Vickers, Reg. No. 19,504 Erik J. Overberger, Reg. No. 48,556

1100 Superior Avenue

7th Floor

Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579

(216) 861-5582

Certificate of Mailing

Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8, I certify that this Amend deposited with the United States Post AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Pat	dment is being stal Service as First Class mail, addressed to: MAIL STOP tents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date
indicated below.	ce with 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 on the date indicated below.
denosited with the United States Pos	stal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service cated below and is addressed to: MAIL STOP AMENDMENT,
Express Mail Label No.:	Signature De Comment
Date	Printed Name
August 31, 2005	Audrey M. Dragony
FILENAME \p N:\LEEE\200311\AMD0004806V001.doc	